

MEMORANDUM FOR: DDA/Career Management Officer

FROM:

DDA Personnel Officer

STAT

SUBJECT: DDA Subgroup Review of Comparative Evaluation Descriptors

1. Two subgroups, Office of Data Processing and Office of Security, support retaining the four Comparative Evaluation Descriptors. The Office of Security suggested minor changes in wording:

*on Panel?*  
CATEGORY I - Should clearly indicate that the employee is a true "super star" and is an absolute certainty in the rater's mind to be on a fast career track. We agree with the one suggestion to change the wording "work performance clearly suggests" to "work performance clearly indicates" a high potential for rapid career growth.

CATEGORY II - Should be worded to describe employees who in the rater's mind are capable of successfully competing for promotion and assignment to positions of higher responsibilities.

CATEGORY III - Should be reserved for employees who have, in all likelihood, peaked and have realized their potential. These would be employees who are making valuable contributions and have no personal or discipline problems. The wording in Category III describing individuals capable of performing successfully at a higher level of responsibility should be deleted.

CATEGORY IV - Like Category I, should be a nonhedging category. This category would contain employees who have serious work or discipline problems. Placing employees in this category would unequivocally state that something has to be done, i.e., counseling, training or separation.

2. Four subgroups, Offices of Finance, Information Services, Medical Services and Training and Education, support a five tier system.

OFFICE OF FINANCE:

CATEGORY I AND II - No change.

CATEGORY III - Valuable contributors and those who may develop high potential.

CATEGORY IV - Employees who are making a limited contribution; have specific deficiencies noted in one or more areas which are deemed to be correctable by career actions, i.e., counseling, reassignment, training, etc., and have probably realized their full potential.

CATEGORY V - Have noted deficiencies which clearly illustrate substandard performance as compared with his/her peers. Have limited value to the Agency and against whom adverse actions may be warranted.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION SERVICES:

CATEGORY I - These are employees whose personal history and work performance clearly indicates a high degree of potential for rapid career growth into positions of increasingly greater responsibility. Employees in this Category are judged to possess experience, knowledge, and talents which presently are clearly exceptional in comparison with their peers. This evaluation should be reflected in career actions that enhance employees' talents and exploit their potential.

CATEGORY II - These are employees whose personal history and work performance indicate the capability to assume greater responsibilities. Employees in this Category are evaluated as presently displaying above average knowledge, talent, and commitment. Career actions should enhance the employees' skills and further develop their potential.

CATEGORY III - These are employees whose personal history and work performance show that they are performing a valuable service in their present assignments. They may be capable of performing successfully at a higher level of responsibility but their knowledge and skills need to be expanded further in the present assignment or through lateral assignment(s). Career actions should provide the opportunity to receive the needed experience/training.

CATEGORY IV - These employees are performing satisfactorily but are close to realizing or have realized their potential. Many employees in this Category are providing valuable service in their present assignment and lateral assignments may not contribute much toward enhancing their talents or their value to the career subgroup. In these cases, career actions should provide for their continued work satisfaction.

CATEGORY V - These are employees whose overall work performance reflects a specific deficiency in, or inability to meet, important aspects of work requirements which unduly limits their value in their assignment or current career area. Employees in this Category may have potential for growth, but their deficiencies are such as to interfere with or preclude improved performance in the current assignment or further development in the career area. These employees will be advised of their deficiencies and placement in this Category. Counseling or remedial training is to be provided. Career actions will be taken to establish whether the talents of some of these employees can be utilized or potential realized in another career function or service within the Agency. The deficiencies in work performance or behavior of some employees in this Category may require their reassignment, demotion or separation.

OFFICE OF MEDICAL SERVICES:

Supports the five descriptors. Per Chief, Psychological Services Staff, five-category system was used in the past as a criterion measure in test evaluation research and found that the system as such works

OFFICE OF TRAINING AND EDUCATION:

CATEGORY I AND II - Remain the same.

CATEGORY III - Too broad, containing both employees doing very well and those who are performing at a less than satisfactory level but not poorly enough to place in Category IV. Remaining categories should be one for those employees who are performing well and have probably reached their potential and another for those who, although their performance is not at the bottom category level, are in need of management attention because of performance concerns. This would allow a more meaningful evaluation, more positive reactions from employees receiving a "valuable contribution" descriptor, and better indicators for counseling employees whose performance is not up to the standard expected.

3. The Office of Logistics was the only subgroup favoring a six-tier system. Reasoning cited for this ranking system listed below:

- a. Confusion caused by overlapping terminology between categories in the current system would be eliminated;
- b. Career Service Panels would have a clearly defined base from which to recommend career actions (promotions, training, reassignments, counseling, etc.);
- c. More meaningful feedback would be available to employees regarding their relative standing with peers; and
- d. Panel members would be obliged to conduct a more in-depth, comprehensive review of employees under their purview in order to ensure placement in the appropriate category.



STAT